

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria Virginia 22313-1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. | |
|---|-----------------|----------------------|------------------------|------------------|--|
| 10/790,098 | 03/02/2004 | Mitsukane Nakashima | GOT-0022 | 1190 | |
| 23353 | 7590 04/28/2005 | | EXAM | EXAMINER | |
| RADER FISHMAN & GRAUER PLLC | | | KASTLER, | KASTLER, SCOTT R | |
| LION BUILDING 1233 20TH STREET N.W., SUITE 501 | |)1 | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER | |
| WASHINGTO | N, DC 20036 | | 1742 | | |
| | | | DATE MAILED: 04/28/200 | 5 | |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| | , | | |
|--|--|---|---------------|
| | Application No. | Applicant(s) | |
| | 10/790,098 | NAKASHIMA, MITSUKANE | Ē |
| Office Action Summary | Examiner | Art Unit | |
| | Scott Kastler | 1742 | |
| The MAILING DATE of this communication a Period for Reply | appears on the cover sheet w | ith the correspondence address | |
| A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REF THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a r - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory peri - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by stat Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the ma earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). | N. 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply within the statutory minimum of this od will apply and will expire SIX (6) MON tute, cause the application to become Al | reply be timely filed ty (30) days will be considered timely. NTHS from the mailing date of this communication BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). | on. |
| Status | | | |
| 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on | , | | |
| | his action is non-final. | | |
| Since this application is in condition for allow closed in accordance with the practice under the condition is in condition for allow closed in accordance with the practice under the condition is in condition for allow closed in accordance with the practice under the condition is in condition for allow closed in accordance with the practice under the condition is in condition for allow closed in accordance with the practice under the condition for allow closed in accordance with the practice under the condition for allow closed in accordance with the practice under the condition for allow closed in accordance with the practice under the condition for allow closed in accordance with the practice under the condition for allow closed in accordance with the practice under the condition for all the condition for all the condition in the condition for all the conditions are conditionally all the | vance except for formal mat | • • | is |
| Disposition of Claims | | | |
| 4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-6 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withd 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-6 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and | rawn from consideration. | | |
| Application Papers | | | |
| 9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Exami 10)☑ The drawing(s) filed on <u>02 March 2004</u> is/are Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct the correct of the correc | e: a) accepted or b) ob he drawing(s) be held in abeyar ection is required if the drawing | nce. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). (s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(| (d). |
| Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 | | | |
| 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority docume 2. Certified copies of the priority docume 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority docume application from the International Bure * See the attached detailed Office action for a li | ents have been received. ents have been received in A riority documents have been eau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). | pplication No received in this National Stage | |
| Attachment(s) | | | |
| Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/0 Paper No(s)/Mail Date 3/2/04. | Paper No(| Summary (PTO-413) s)/Mail Date nformal Patent Application (PTO-152) | |

Art Unit: 1742

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the admitted prior art of the instant disclosure in view of Yamaoka. The admitted prior art of the instant disclosure, in instant figures 5-7 for example, teaches a metal melting furnace (100) including a preheating flue (120) provided on it's upper portion with a material inlet opening, and on it's lower portion with an inclined hearth and a melting burner (125) oriented toward the lower portion of the flue and including a meltable material holder (150), a molten metal reservoir (135) provided with a temperature maintaining burner (136), and an inspection door (124), thereby showing all aspects of the above claims except a separation wall or the specifically recited component configurations (a cylindrical meltable material holder or specific separation wall configurations). Yamoka teaches that in melting furnaces including a preheating flue (7), inclined hearth (8) and molten material reservoir (9) it was known in the art at the time the invention was made to include a separation wall (6) including a melt passage (5) a slag blocking portion (21) and an exhaust gas opening (14) between the inclined hearth and the molten material reservoir (9) in order to provide a cleaner, higher quality melt by reducing or preventing the mixing of oxides and deposits into the melt (see col. 1 lines 39-45 for example). Because the instantly recited components in the prior art (the separation wall and meltable material holder (150)) operate in substantially the same manner with substantially the same results as the same

Art Unit: 1742

components in the instant claims, it would have been a modification obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to alter the configurations of these components to any other equally useful configuration, since it has been well settled that motivation to alter the shape or configuration of a component without materially altering the operation of that component would have been a modification obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made. See MPEP 2144.04 IV B, and *In re Dailey* 149 USPQ 47. Because the furnace system of the admitted prior art of the instant disclosure would also desire a cleaner melt, motivation to include a separation wall, as taught by Yamoka to provide a cleaner melt in furnaces of the type disclosed by the admitted prior art of the instant disclosure, where the wall and other components are of any equally useful configuration, would have been a modification obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Each of Japanese'877, Japanese'979, Nakashima, and Iida are all cited as further examples of metal melting furnaces.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Scott Kastler whose telephone number is (571) 272-1243. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Roy King can be reached on (571) 272-1244. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Application/Control Number: 10/790,098 Page 4

Art Unit: 1742

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Scott Kastler Primary Examiner Art Unit 1742

sk